



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/987,407	11/14/2001	Moriaki Shimabukuro	PNDF-01180	7034

21254 7590 10/23/2006

MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

LEZAK, ARRIENNE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/987,407

Applicant(s)

SHIMABUKURO, MORIAKI

Examiner

Arrienne M. Lezak

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Examiner notes that Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10, 11, 14 & 17 have been amended, Claims 19 & 20 have been added and no claims have been canceled. Claims not explicitly addressed herein are found to be addressed within prior Office Action dated 13 April 2006 as reiterated herein below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 4 & 14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, Examiner finds the wording "wherein said Web page data comprises said banner advertising data only when said voice synthesis operation setting indicates that said voice synthesis is operable" (per pending Claims 4 & 14), and to be a condition not supported within the specification. Proper correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-20 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,732,216 to Logan in view of US Patent US 6,587,127 B1 to Leeke in view of US Patent US 6,339,438 B1 to Bates.

5. Regarding Claims 1-7, 8, 10, 12 & 14-20, Logan discloses a voice banner advertisement system, method and apparatus for performing an advertisement with voice comprising:

- a Web server constituted by Web page data transmission means for constituting contents data and banner advertisement data to be offered to a user to transmit the Web page data in response to said Web server receiving a URL from said user terminal, (Fig. 1; Col. 4, lines 39-67; Cols. 5 & 6; & Col. 7, lines 1-2), (Examiner notes that user submission of URL information to web servers for purposes of receiving and browsing the associated web pages, (per Applicant's specification, p. 7, lines 15-21), as transmitted by the web servers was well-known at the time of invention by Applicant) and

- history information recording means for recording as history information the number of times at which a banner advertisement is transmitted as history information, (Fig. 1; Col. 5, lines 35-38; Col. 6, lines 27-35; & Col. 8, lines 3-43), and;
- a user terminal constituted by communication means for performing data communication with the Web server through the network, (per Claim 15), (Internet – per pending claims 8, 12 & 18), (Fig. 1; Col. 3, lines 23-67; & Col. 4, lines 1-37), (Additionally, Examiner notes that Logan teaches user supplied information pertaining to a user dataset, (Col. 5, lines 33-44), which dataset obviously includes information pertaining to user apparatus “speech synthesis” capabilities, and which dataset aids in distinguishing between program segments used. Further, Logan teaches defining audio programming with HTML, wherein narrative content to be presented in audio form is described utilizing HTML, (Fig. 7), and wherein it would have been obvious to have default code as well as default pages available for distribution based on user response and capabilities, (as noted within the user dataset), for purposes of supplying properly formatted and readable pages based on user apparatus capabilities);
- Web page browsing means for browsing a Web page offered by the Web server, (per pending Claim 16), (Col. 5, lines 3-35), and

- voice synthesis means for extracting banner advertisement data from the received Web page data and converting the banner advertisement data into voice by voice synthesis to utter the banner advertisement data, (per pending claim 14), (Col. 3, lines 32-41; Col. 4, lines 66-67; Col. 5, lines 1-31 – hypertext anchors);
- voice synthesis operation setting means for setting whether the voice synthesis means is made valid or not and transmitting the setting contents to the Web server only when said voice synthesis means is operable/valid, (per pending claims 2, 5, 7 & 17), (Col. 7, lines 5-35; Col. 9, lines 18-27; Col. 10, lines 15-37; Col. 44, lines 16-60; Col. 44; & Col. 45, lines 1-16), (Additionally, Examiner notes that an obvious, well known and necessary functionality within a speech synthesis capable apparatus, (such as a cellular phone), would be a means by which to activate and de-activate the speech synthesis capability per the needs and circumstances of different users of the same apparatus, wherein which ability to activate and de-activate the speech synthesis means and the respective status, would clearly and obviously be determinative of any data reliant thereon, as it would be senseless to send data reliant on a voice synthesis means to an apparatus incapable of performing the same);
- display means for displaying the web page data received from the web server, (Fig. 1); and

- the Web server transmits the advertisement data to the user terminal only when the voice synthesis means is valid, and wherein the Web server records history information, (i.e.: usage), (per pending claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 19 & 20), (Col. 7, lines 5-67; Col. 8; Col. 9, lines 18-27; Col. 10, lines 15-37; Col. 44; Col. 44, lines 66-67; & Col. 45, lines 1-16).

6. Examiner notes that though Logan teaches advertisement data, Logan does not specifically teach banners. To incorporate banners into the Logan advertising data would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by Applicant as banners were well known in HTML and the use of the same for advertising and general information purposes would likewise have been a well known means by which to display information to a user. That noted, per Applicant's request, Examiner further provides the Leeke art which clearly teaches the use of user supplied information, (Col. 4, lines 50-67 & Col. 6, lines 3-56), and banner advertisements, (Figs. 37-39, 47 & Col. 32, lines 35-47). As Leeke teaches a graphical user interface, (GUI), within an Internet environment, and incorporating banner advertising data, Logan clearly shows that the use of banner advertisements within web pages was well-known at the time of invention by Applicant. Moreover, as both Logan and Leeke teach Internet advertisements, it would have been obvious to incorporate a particular advertisement type, (i.e.: banners), as taught by Leeke, into the Logan system, motivation for which would be the distribution of audio/visual program segment/advertising over the Internet, (Logan – Col. 1, lines 29-33; Col. 4, lines 66-67; & Col. 5, lines 1-5), thus rendering Applicant's invention unpatentable.

7. Additionally, Examiner finds that Applicant's amended claim language "wherein clause" represents a result achieved, and as such is not necessarily a claim element. That noted, Examiner finds that though the combined teachings of Logan and Leeke clearly teach a voice banner advertisement system, method and apparatus for performing an advertisement with voice, they do not necessarily do so for the specific purpose of display maximization. However, Examiner finds that it would have been obvious to extract advertising data for purposes of display maximization, the teaching and motivation for which is clearly found within Bates, which notes "to maximize the amount of information displayed by a window, it is often desirable to maximize the relative size of the display region of the window...regardless of how advertisements are displayed, the advertisements occupy space on the computer display that could otherwise be used to display the information, (i.e.: contents data of the web page data received from the web server), requested by the user", (Bates – Col. 1, lines 56-67 & Col. 2, lines 1-12). Thus, Examiner finds that Bates clearly teaches the result achieved from using the combined teachings of Logan and Leeke to maximize the display means by uttering the extracted advertising data and displaying only the contents data of the web page data received from the web server. Thus, Claims 1-7, 8, 10, 12 & 14-20 are found to be unpatentable over the combined teachings of Logan, Leeke and Bates.

8. Regarding Claims 9 & 13, Logan, Leeke and Bates are relied upon for those teachings noted herein above. Logan further teaches a voice banner advertisement system wherein the banner advertisement data in the Web page data comprises a voice synthesis tag, (Col. 5, lines 7-45), (Examiner notes that the use of hypertext anchors

clearly reads upon the use of tags, wherein the use of said hypertext anchors would obviously encompass any and all program content, (including voice synthesis content), within an audio message exchange system such as Logan, which system clearly incorporates the use of voice synthesis). Thus, Claims 9 & 13 are found to be unpatentable over the combined teachings of Logan, Leeke and Bates.

9. Regarding Claim 11, Logan, Leeke and Bates are relied upon for those teachings noted herein above. Logan further teaches a voice banner advertisement system wherein the Web page data transmission means constitutes the Web page data including banner advertisement data on the basis of the setting contents, (Col. 7, lines 8-21). Examiner interprets "setting contents" to mean data transmitted based on a particular setting or set of preferences, wherein Logan clearly teaches the use of "user preferences" as the basis for data compilation and transmission. Thus, Claim 11 is found to be unpatentable over the combined teachings of Logan, Leeke and Bates.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 13 July 2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made.

11. In response to applicant's prior argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that

any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Examiner has addressed Applicant's request for proof that banner advertisements were well-known at the time of invention, as noted herein above. Additionally, Examiner finds that the combined teachings of Logan, Leeke and Bates clearly and obviously disclose each and every element of Applicant's claimed invention, rendering the same unpatentable.

12. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Additionally, Examiner finds that the combined teachings of Logan, Leeke and Bates clearly and obviously disclose each and every element of Applicant's claimed invention, rendering the same unpatentable.

13. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2143

the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Examiner respectfully disagrees noting the motivation to combine the references is stated clearly herein above.

14. Regarding Applicant's prior argument that the banner advertisement data is not uttered, Examiner respectfully disagrees noting Logan's teaching of hypertext anchors, voice synthesis and advertising data, (Col. 4, lines 66-67 & Col. 5, lines 1-45), which advertising data would obviously include banner advertisements, (as noted herein as taught by Leeke), wherein any information, (including, but not limited to the banner advertisements), within the Logan system could obviously be accompanied by the necessary hypertext anchors needed for voice synthesis of the same.

15. In response to applicant's prior argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the feature upon which applicant relies (i.e., the compilation file included in the web page) is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Additionally, Examiner notes that the data transmitted to the user comprises a combination of all data transmitted from the server to the client, which data, (as clearly taught by Logan), includes, but is not limited to advertising data, (alone or within a compilation), and web page data, (Logan – Fig. 1). Additionally, as banner advertisements within web pages were well-known in the art at the time of invention, (and as taught by Leeke), it would have been obvious for the advertisement

data to come directly from the web pages, (and be extracted directly from the web pages), (as taught by Bates), thus eliminating the need for separate advertisement data and maximizing the display area.

16. Regarding Applicant's prior argument that the transfer of the compilation file is accomplished via the FTP server, Examiner respectfully disagrees noting that the Internet pathway ultimately communicates all data, (Logan – Fig. 1; Col. 5, lines 32-44; & Col. 7, lines 8-21).

17. Examiner has addressed Applicant's Amendment, and has further rejected all claims, as noted herein above. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

18. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US Patent US 6,760,746 B1 to Schneider;

US Patent US 6,192,340 B1 to Abecassis;

US Patent US 6,400,806 B1 to Uppaluru;

US Patent US 6,175,819 B1 to Van Alstine.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arrienne M. Lezak whose telephone number is (571)-272-3916. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571)-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AML

Arrienne M. Lezak
Examiner
Art Unit 2143d


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100